

REMARKS

Claims 1 through 8 remain in the application. New claims 9 through 12 have been added to the application.

First, Claims 5 and 6 stand object to because of certain informalities. Each of the claims 5 and 6 have been amend to correct the informalities noted by the Examiner.

Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was allegedly not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Claim 4 also stands rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 4 recites "wherein the first and second grooves extend around the circumference of said second sealing surface defined by said lip." The Examiner has stated that it is unclear what is meant by this limitation. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's objections. However, to assist in the Examiner's ability to understand the claim limitation more clearly, claim 4 has been amended to recite "wherein said first and second grooves extend radially around the circumference of said second sealing surface defined by said lid". First, the second sealing surface is defined in claim 1 as the surface along the circumferential periphery of the outer peripheral part of the lid. Therefore, claim 4 clearly places the first and second grooves around this circumferential periphery of the second sealing surface. This limitation is fully set forth and supported in the specification on pages 4 and 5 and in the drawings of Figure 2. Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner more clearly explain the uncertainty and/or lack of clarity in the amended claim language?

Claims 1-6 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over DePew '372 in view of Koppel '297 and in view of Aumon '485. Applicant strongly disagrees.

First, the Examiner acknowledges and admits that De Pew '372 does not disclose a second sealing surface facing the first sealing surface, a second radial groove or a second sealing ring. However, the Examiner claims that Aumon '485 discloses that it is known to provide a second sealing surface, axial groove and sealing ring in between the lid and wall of a drum and further that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to modify the closure of De Pew to provide a second sealing surface, axial groove and sealing ring as disclosed by Aumon '485. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's citation of Aumon '485. Upon review of the translated Abstract of Aumon '485 available by Derwent, the disclosure relates to a reclosable package with mechanical locking including a body (11) of the package and the lid (14) each comprise a groove (19, 20), the two grooves facing one another in the closed position in order to constitute an annular space (21), and a flexible rod (24) is inserted in this annular space in order to lock the lid in the closed position. It is clear from the brief description and drawings that Aumon discloses only one sealing ring (26) located in a third groove (27). The flexible rod (24) in the groove (19, 20) is used to lock the lid to the body. The ball (29) on the end of the rod (24) would prevent sealing between the lid and body. Thus, the rod (24) is not a sealing ring. Therefore, Aumon does not disclose a second sealing surface, axial groove, and sealing ring between the lid and wall of the drum. Therefore, even the modification of De Pew to include the teachings of Aumon fails to provide first and second sealing surfaces, first and second groove and first and second sealing rings to obtain the benefit of an improved sealing arrangement between the lid and opening. Such modifications merely provide De Pew with a reclosable and lockable lid, but not a double seal.

Further, neither Aumon nor De Pew disclose the additional limitation set forth in new claims 9 and 10 of a sealing gap formed between said first sealing surface and the part of said second sealing surface extending between said spaced apart radial grooves for limiting the contact surface area of fuel vapors with said second sealing ring and thereby increase the permeation resistance of said sealing engagement between said lid and said opening.

Regarding claim 2, the Examiner contends that it would be obvious to provide the lip of De Pew '372 with the reinforcing member of Koppel '297 wherein Koppel allegedly discloses a reinforcing member secured to the wall and surrounding the opening. However, Koppel only discloses a liner for a steel barrel and not any type of sealing surfaces or sealing rings. Further, the Examiner has already admitted that De Pew fails to disclose the second sealing surface, second groove and second sealing ring. Therefore, Koppel does not in any way assist in overcoming the deficiencies of De Pew as acknowledged by the Examiner.

Regarding claims 3-6, the Examiner's rejection based solely on the De Pew '372 completely contradicts the prior admission that De Pew '372 does not disclose a second sealing surface, second groove, second sealing ring or reinforcing member. Therefore, the rejection of claims 3-6 is incorrect and improper and must be withdrawn.

Finally, claim 7 stands rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw '937 in view of Aumon '485. Again, Applicant respectfully disagrees because of the deficiencies of Aumon, which does not disclose a second sealing surface, second groove or second sealing ring. As discussed hereinabove, even the modification of Shaw to include the teachings of Aumon fails to provide first and second sealing surfaces, first and second groove and first and second sealing rings to obtain the benefit of an improved sealing arrangement

Appl'n No: 10/052,185
Amdt dated August 19, 2003
Reply to Office action dated February 19, 2003

between the lid and opening. Such modifications merely provide Shaw with a reclosable and lockable lid, but not a double seal.

Claim 8 has been indicated as allowable and remains the same.

Accordingly, it is believed that the application is in condition for more favorable consideration and allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Robin W. Asher, Reg. No. 41,590
Clark Hill PLC
500 Woodward Avenue, Suite 3500
Detroit, MI 48226-3435
(313) 965-8897

Date: 8/19/03
Attorney Docket No: 19361-089285